

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIT	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,906 08/21/2003		21/2003	Yungtaek Jang	36977-190011	6439
26694	7590	05/27/2005		EXAMINER	
VENABLE LLP				RILEY, SHAWN	
P.O. BOX 343	85				
WASHINGTO	N, DC 2	0045-9998		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2838	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

		1 1	
Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/644,906	JANG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Shawn Riley	2838		

	Shawn Riley	2838	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
HE REPLY FILED 29 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP			
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follown places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the contract of t	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origon than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropr jinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of le appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); etter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re	TE below); educing or simplifying	
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co		
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 4 and 17-23. Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-16,24 and 25. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
entered because the affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessarily. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the content of	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperty and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).	
•		SHAWN RILEY	

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: To clarify the record, the following is noted: 1) applicants state:

As clearly stated in paragraph 36 [emphasis added], fourth line from the bottom of page 11 of the specification, the alternating energy source isolates primary transformer TR from the switches and provides the needed energy for achieving ZVS. Accordingly, in response to the First Office Action, Claim 1 was amended to qualify the required "alternating energy source" as one that "isolates the at least one power transformer from said one or more controllable switching devices." It was argued that the claimed invention is distinguished over Kammiller because the disclosed inductor (14) and capacitor (16) do not constitute an alternating energy source that isolates the primary transformer TR.

Explanation:

Applicants response to the non-final office action directed the examiner to paragraph 35-not paragraph 36 as implied. (see applicants remarks, at page 10, of 15 feb 2005). The examiner did his best to reply to the question being asked.

2) applicants state:

The Final Action states that "nowhere what applicant state repeated in paragraph 35, i.e., an isolated transformer TR."

Explanation:

That is not surprising since applicant referenced the examiner to the wrong pargraph.

3) applicants state:

The applicants are at a loss as to what is meant by "isolated transformer." Although the exemplary embodiment of the invention uses a transformer as the alternating energy source that [to] isolates the primary transformer TR from the switches, the phrase "isolated transformer" does not appear as a limitation in any of the claims. [emphasis added]

Explanation:

The examiner can not explain the applicants loss at understanding what an "isolated transformer" means but can simply explain the following. When something is used to create something else it is common to use a short hand term. The invention uses a first transformer to isolate a second transformer - couldn't the second transformer be considered an isolated transformer? Again, the examiner was trying to be resposive to the applicant who misdirected the examiner to a different paragraph then the applicant based (and continues to base) their arguments on.

4) aplicants state;

The Final Action highlights a statement in paragraph 35 [again this is based on applicants direction-see above] of the specification regarding "an isolated phase shift controlled full bridge converter creates conditions for achieving ZVS...." and argues that "the full bridge converter is operated as a ZVS device and is isolated in the same manner as Kimiller." However, the claim require [sic] isolation of the primary transformer TR from the switches. [emphasis added]. No such isolation is disclosed in the Kimmiller.

Explanation;

The isolation occurs based on the resonating function of the 14 and 16 and as described in at least figures 3a-3b which show how nodes d vis a vis node b function out of synch to create an isolation in the same type of manner as applicants claimed invention.

5) applicants state;

Even assuming that inductor (14) and capacitor (16) comprise an alternating energy source, there is no isolation between such source and the disclosed power transformer. [emphasis added.]

Explanation;

This is a spurious argument.

The actual wording of the claim states:

at least one alternating energy source that isolates the at least one power transformer from said one or more controllable switching devices. [emphasis added.]

The source isolates the transformer from the switching devices, the claim says nothing about an isolated source, (or if this is not clear there is no isolation claimed between the source and the transformer).

6) aplicants state;

As sated [sic] in response to the previous Action, Kammiller discloses a full-bridge phase displaced resonant transition circuit having a center-tap placed on the power transformer primary winding. The center-tap is cormected to the inductor (14) at one end with another end of the inductor connected to a large capacitor (16). It is respectfully submitted that the inductor (14) and capacitor (16) of Kammiller do not constitute an alternating energy source that isolates the primary transformer TR.

Explaination;

Kammiller does constitute an ac source that isolates the primary transformer TR, as described at number section 3 herein, for at least the reasons described therein.

For at least the above reasons, this advisory has been generated.